UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
39th meeting
held on
Friday, 16 November 1990
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 39th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. RANA (Nepal)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of and action on all disarmament agenda items (continued)
- Statement by the Chairman

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/45/PV.39
26 November 1990
ENGLISH

90-63238 3173V (E)

best copy available

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 66 AND 155 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This afternoon the Committee will first proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.30, A/C.1/45/L.31 and A/C.1/45/L.41, in cluster 11. Then the Committee will take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.12/Rev.1, in cluster 12. After completing action on those draft resolutions, the Committee will take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.10, A/C.1/45/L.49 and A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1, in cluster 13.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.30, A/C.1/45/L.31 and A/C.1/45/L.41 in cluster 11.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of their positions on draft resolutions in cluster 11.

Mr. HYLTENIUS (Sweden): I should like to make a statement concerning issues relating to the draft resolutions in cluster 11. Sweden is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.30, entitled "Cessation of all nuclear test explosions", and of A/C.1/45/L.41, entitled "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty". My delegation will not elaborate on the well-known and long-standing position of Sweden with regard to a nuclear-test ban. We would, for obvious reasons, prefer the mandate for the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban of the Conference on Disarmament to be as far-reaching as possible, but we consider that form should not prevail over substance, and that the important thing is that the Conference on Disarmament should at least, and finally, devote itself to substantive work on a global and comprehensive test ban.

During this session of the First Committee, intensive consultations have been going on to merge draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.30 and A/C.1/45/L.41. A very constructive approach, and considerable flexibility, have been displayed by the part of the sponsors of both draft resolutions; this led to a compromise text that, in substance, would invite, or should invite, broad support within this Committee.

However, we have learned that some States have indicated that they would not be in a position to support this compromise. We strongly deplore this, and the fact that a draft, merged resolution could therefore not be put forward. The comprehensive test ban is a matter which must be actively pursued, both on its own merits and in view of other important issues in the field of nuclear disarmament. We see this as an important opportunity lost.

Mr. TOTH (Hungary): The First Committee is to take action on three draft resolutions related to the issue of comprehensive nuclear test ban. Those draft resolutions are A/C.1/45/L.30, A/C.1/45/L.31 and A/C.1/45L.41. In the context of those draft resolutions, I should like to outline the position of Hungary on the issue of the comprehensive test-ban treaty.

Hungary is firmly committed to the aim of a comprehensive and universal nuclear test-ban treaty. Such a treaty would constitute an enormous step forward in the global process of disarmament, as it would counteract the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear weapons, curbing the nuclear arms race. A comprehensive test ban would also strengthen the non-proliferation régime, the importance of which cannot be overestimated.

We welcome the decision of the Conference on Disarmament, which, after a lapse of seven years, made it possible to re-establish the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban. The consensus which emerged on a flexible mandate was a very positive shift from some previous positions, and it is essential for this approach to be further maintained in order to open up real chances for the work of the Ad Hoc Committee to succeed.

For my delegation, the main lesson to be drawn from the failures and achievements of the last decade is that the issue of a comprehensive test ban cannot be solved by one single measure. All of the possible ways and means, including bilateral and multilateral negotiations and also appropriate interim measures, must be utilized to the greatest extent. The gradual approach, though it might sometimes not live up to all expectations, given the urgency of the matter, has proved its usefulness on several occasions.

We consider the forthcoming Amendment Conference of the partial test-ban Treaty as another important event among our endeavours towards a comprehensive test ban. Having in mind the present status of multilateral disarmament negotiations,

(Mr. Toth, Hungary)

participants in the Amendment Conference must be clearly aware that any failure would raise serious questions about the role and future of multilateralism in the field of disarmament. Therefore, in preparing for that Conference, no delegations must evade the question what might be a realistic and sensible objective, neither too modest to take advantage of the opportunities which exist, nor too ambitious, leading to a general inflexibility of positions and preventing substantial progress.

In recent years, it has been stated on a number of occasions that the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear tests can be achieved only by concluding an adequately verifiable treaty. It is our firm belief that in the present situation, the development of wide-ranging verification measures offers the most obvious possibility in seeking ways towards our final aim. Consequently, in our interpretation, the outcome of the Amendment Conference would be positive if the Conference made recommendations on the development of verification measures related to a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The question of the development of wide-ranging verification measures related to a comprehensive test-ban treaty should be dealt with in the Conference on Disarmament from a clearly defined viewpoint, which would make it possible both to establish the principles of operation for a complex system and to avoid protracting disputes of a political nature.

As a first step in this longer-term process, the Ad Hoc Group of Seismic Experts at the Conference on Disarmament could be given a mandate to widen its sphere of activity and prepare a seismic verification system for actual operation. Another measure might be to carry out technical research on those aspects of verification - primarily, on the methods for analysing atmospheric radioactivity, and on-site inspections - which might serve as further, significant elements in the complex system. As the appropriate forum, the Conference on Disarmament could be

READEX FICHE

(Mr. Toth, Hungary)

requested to set up a separate technical group for that purpose. That expert group could study the various verification methods as a complex, and negotiate a proposal for a system which would be both reliable and cost-effective.

The present circumstances offer two courses of action: either we continue to be realistic and bring our wishes into line with the possibilities that exist, taking each small opportunity to move towards the final aim, or we demand outright that a comprehensive test ban be concluded. Having in mind the present status of multilateral disarmament negotiations, we are firmly convinced that the first course of action is the only one to pursue.

Mr. COLLINS (Ireland): Ireland is pleased to be a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.30, on the cessation of all nuclear-test explosions, and of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41, on the urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. The Government of Ireland attaches the highest priority to the early achievement of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

As we indicated in our statement during the general debate in this Committee on 24 October, we consider that the total prohibition of nuclear testing should be seen as the first step towards disarmament, not as the final stage, to be undertaken only after the other elements of disarmament have been agreed. (A/C.1/45/PV.15, p. 36)

We were encouraged by the recent re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban at the Conference on Disarmament. However, we consider that, to be effective, that Committee must be speedily empowered to undertake real negotiations. All nuclear-weapon States should participate in these negotiations, with a view to reaching an early and successful conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

Bearing these considerations in mind, Ireland welcomes the intensive consultations that took place between the co-sponsors of the two draft resolutions with a view to agreeing on a combined text which would command the widest possible support in this Committee. We would like to commend the efforts of all the delegations involved. We consider that the text that was produced represented a good basis for pursuing negotiations towards the objective of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty.

We regret that it has not been possible this year to submit the combined text for consideration and adoption by this Committee. However, we hope that a more positive outcome will be possible next year. We will endeavour to facilitate this.

Mr. O'BRIEN (New Zealand): This morning the representative of Australia introduced, on behalf of 29 sponsors, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/45/L.41, entitled "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty".

I am speaking now as a co-sponsor of that draft resolution to reiterate New Zealand's conviction that work on a nuclear-test-ban treaty must be carried forward as a matter of urgency. In recent years we have, of course, seen real progress in the field of nuclear disarmament. Nuclear arsenals are beginning at last to be reduced significantly, but further reductions in the number of nuclear weapons should not be a necessary pre-condition for a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We are entirely at one with the representative of Ireland on that point.

It is our belief that such a ban has its own absolutely compelling, independent rationale. A comprehensive test-ban would constitute a fundamental restraint on nuclear weapons by limiting vertical and horizontal proliferation - a crucial consideration at this time of change in the world order as the old cold-war rigidities disappear.

(Mr. O'Brien, New Zealand)

We know that this view is shared by the vast majority of States represented in this Committee. Last year, 145 Members of the United Nations voted in favour of the predecessor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41, which is now before us. We think that the strong support demonstrated then for that draft resolution contributed to the re-establishment, after an interval of several years, of the Conference on Disarmament's Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban. We look forward to the continuation of substantive work on this subject in the Conference on Disarmament next year, since in our view the conclusion of a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing remains an indispensable requirement if we are to capitalize on the changes and opportunities that the end of the cold war now brings.

In addition to being one of the main sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41, New Zealand will also be supporting draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.30, which was introduced this morning by the representative of Mexico.

As my Australian colleague has already noted, there have in recent weeks been serious and intensive discussions between the main sponsors of both draft resolutions in an attempt to reach a single text that would command the overwhelming support of the international community. A single text would allow the United Nations to speak with one voice on a subject of fundamental importance in the field of nuclear disarmament, and the point about the desirability of the United Nations speaking with one voice was well made this morning by more than one representative in the explanations of vote on southern Africa.

A single text on a test ban would reflect the fact that indeed there is a change in the direction of a new and more hopeful order of things in our world and it would constitute, too, an important achievement in the rationalization of the work of this Committee - an objective which, I think, we all share.

(Mr. O'Brien, New Zealand)

In recent days it appeared that we might indeed have been able to bring together a text before this Committee owing to the notably constructive and flexible approach demonstrated by the two groups of sponsors. We endorse entirely the remarks of the Mexican Ambassador in this connection this morning. New Zealand, like Ireland and Australia, very much regrets the fact that the balanced and realistic texts which the two sets of sponsors developed as the basis for a merger have not in the time available met with the support of some other States. We feel confident that the discussion of the issues involved in this text over a longer time frame might have yielded a more positive response.

We hope that the progress achieved in the discussions will in the future be followed up in an appropriate way. There is an onus on us all to approach the matter in a constructive and forward-looking manner.

The CHAIRMAN: As no delegations have expressed the wish to explain their vote before the voting, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.30, with the oral revision read out by the representative of Mexico this morning.

The draft resolution, which is entitled "Cessation of all nuclear-test explosions", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 30th meeting of the First Committee on 16 November 1990.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.30 are: Afghanistan, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, Myanmar, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.30, with the oral amendment read out by Mexico. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.30 as orally revised was adopted by 107 votes to 3, with 18 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31, entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 35th meeting of the First Committee, on 13 November 1990.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of co-sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31 are as follows: Afghanistan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cape Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31 was adopted by 98 votes to 2, with 28 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41 entitled "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 16 November 1990.

I call upon the Committee Secretary to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41 has the following sponsors: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Fiji,

(Mr. Kheradi)

Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Surinam, Sweden, Thailand, Vanuatu and Zaire.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, China, India, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41 was adopted by 122 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of their vote.

Ms. CONWAY (Ireland): I should like to explain why the delegation of Ireland was obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31, which has just been adopted by the Committee.

The clear and unequivocal support of the Government of Ireland for a comprehensive test-ban treaty was outlined in our statement on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.30 and L.41 a few minutes ago. As we indicated in that statement, we consider that the Conference on Disarmament must be speedily empowered to undertake real negotiations with a view to an early and successful conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. All nuclear-weapon States should participate in these negotiations.

Ireland recognizes the motives behind the convening of the forthcoming negotiations on the amendment of the partial test-ban Treaty. We hope that the Amendment Conference, in which we will participate constructively, will lead to a commitment by all States - including, most importantly, the nuclear-weapon States - to a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

We note with satisfaction the agreement on the organizational aspects of the forthcoming Conference which was reached at the meeting held in New York last June.

However, my delegation has reservations about a number of the proposals contained in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31. We consider, for example, that it would be more appropriate for the States parties to the partial test-ban Treaty to reach consensus on how the forthcoming Amendment Conference should be followed-up. This consensus would then be submitted for the approval of the General Assembly. This worthwhile practice has been followed in the context of the various review conferences of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

(Ms. Conway, Ireland)

As this draft resolution diverges from this practice, my delegation was constrained to abstain on it. However, we support the call in paragraph 3 for a moratorium on nuclear-weapons tests, pending conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): During the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly my delegation made a detailed explanation of vote on the issue of nuclear testing, as well as on the subject of a special conference with the aim of amending the partial test-ban Treaty.

The Netherlands position has not changed since then. We can again confirm our commitment to a comprehensive test ban as a long-term goal, framed in the perspective of the broader context of the process of disarmament and nuclear disarmament in particular. The issue of a comprehensive test ban cannot be seen in isolation. Nuclear testing is an essential component of a policy whereby reliance exists on nuclear weapons whose function is to prevent all wars, not just a nuclear war.

The implication of this policy is therefore that, prior to nuclear testing being reduced and eventually banned, a political situation must have come about in which the risk of war is very drastically reduced.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

Europe has been working to that end. A comprehensive set of negotiations has been set in motion; it has already had results and, it is to be hoped, will very soon start yielding further substantial results. In the East-West context major developments are under way. One of the consequences of those developments is, and will increasingly be, a reduced reliance on nuclear weapons.

The alliance to which the Netherlands belongs is a defensive one. It will never in any circumstance be the first to use force. Its goal remains enduring peace in Europe. The Netherlands is not oblivious to the implications of the changes in Europe. It has on various occasions warmly welcomed the prospects they hold out. As a member of a defensive alliance it has also acknowledged that following the political changes and the success in the negotiations on a broad disarmament agenda, reliance on nuclear weapons can be reduced. This is a reflection of a development whereby, as a consequence of the changed pattern of relationships, a new defensive strategy will be adopted making nuclear weapons truly weapons of last resort.

The various negotiations have been subject to increased momentum. Success on some items on the broad disarmament agenda has already been achieved; on others it is near. The issue of nuclear testing is a part of this broad process. I need not go into detail, but the picture of arms control and disarmament in the East-West context looks spectacular: INF, START, CFE, CSBMs, and in the future further negotiations, such as SNF and, why not, START II and further conventional reductions. And not only are our conventional forces being reduced, but the transparency of military activities in Europe is being sharply enhanced.

Now that the negotiations on the verification protocols for the Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty have ended successfully, it is necessary to look ahead at further implementation of the process of limiting nuclear tests, which was started in September 1987 between the United States and

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

the USSR. The radical reductions of nuclear weapons which have already been agreed, and are in the offing, should be incorporated into our approach towards the negotiations on limiting nuclear tests.

We really do hope that the negotiations between the United States and the USSR on further intermediate limitations of nuclear tests will resume as soon as possible. Further restrictions on the level and number of tests to a minimum level, along the road to further reducing nuclear weapons and reliance on those weapons in the strategy of deterrence, would signify meaningful progress on the way to a comprehensive test ban at the appropriate moment.

This approach is our underlying consideration for our votes on the issues of nuclear testing and the partial test-ban treaty amendment conference. Indeed, draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.30, A/C.1/45/L.31 and A/C.1/45/L.41 are incompatible with that policy and therefore we cannot give them our unqualified support, however much we agree that the end result of our combined efforts should be the achievement of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

It is to that end also that the Netherlands considers further work on various interrelated test-ban issues in the Conference on Disarmament to be necessary and essential. There is still a lot of multilateral groundwork to be undertaken if, at the multilateral level, we are to be ready at all for a comprehensive test-ban treaty when the time is ripe. There is therefore still a lot of substantial work to be done in the Conference on Disarmament, for example on the issue of verification and compliance, as well as on other elements concerning a nuclear-test ban and we welcome the resumption of the work on nuclear testing in the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament. We hope that this work will continue early in 1991 when the Conference on Disarmament resumes its work.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

While recognizing that a comprehensive test ban remains fully valid as an essential objective, my delegation is convinced that it must be addressed as part of the disarmament process. A comprehensive test ban cannot be approached in isolation. This is in essence the problem we have with draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31, on the amendment conference, both in conceptual and organizational terms. As I just stated, such a ban would require a considerable amount of prior substantive work. The January amendment conference can therefore certainly not serve as a short-cut towards a comprehensive test ban.

For the same reasons we cannot support the proposals contained in paragraphs 4, 5, and 6 of A/C.1/45/L.31, which envisage a perennialization of the specific amendment efforts. Such a permanent process based on singling out the test ban will in our view not bear fruit and therefore cannot be conducive to the goal we all seek.

This having been said, my delegation will certainly not fail to grasp the good opportunity offered by the January conference for an open and constructive exchange of ideas on the subject.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): With respect to Japan's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.30, L.31 and L.41, on which voting has just been conducted, I should like to state the following position of Japan on nuclear-testing issues.

Japan has consistently attached great importance to the early realization of a verifiable comprehensive nuclear-test ban, and has always been actively involved in efforts to achieve this goal at the Conference on Disarmament and other international forums. At the same time, such a test ban would have to be realized without jeopardizing the security of States. Therefore, it would not be realistic, in our view, to try to achieve a comprehensive test ban at once simply by concluding an agreement or amending an existing treaty. Japan believes that a

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

step-by-step approach is the soundest way, and in the final analysis the fastest way, to achieve a comprehensive test ban.

Japan is convinced that the Conference on Disarmament provides the best avenue for reaching our shared goal of a comprehensive test ban. Japan therefore highly appreciates the re-establishment this year of the Nuclear Test Ban Ad Hoc Committee in the Conference on Disarmament and strongly hopes that the Ad Hoc Committee will be re-established at the beginning of the 1991 session of the Conference on Disarmament under the same mandate as this year in order to pursue substantive work on all aspects of a comprehensive test ban on the basis of an objective assessment of the real situation, including the important progress in the bilateral United States-Soviet Union talks on nuclear testing.

As draft resolution L.30 does not seem to reflect such a realistic approach, Japan had to abstain in the vote on it, even though Japan has the same goal as the countries that sponsored it.

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

As for draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31, Japan regards the partial test-ban Treaty Amendment Conference as providing another opportunity to discuss various ways to achieve a comprehensive test ban, and hopes that the discussion at the Conference will turn out to be as constructive as possible by way of co-operation and mutual understanding between nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States. From this viewpoint, Japan will participate in the Conference. At the same time, however, Japan takes the view that the recommendations made in operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution will bring about unnecessary duplication of the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. LEHMAN (United States of America): The United States has asked for the floor to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.30, entitled "Cessation of all nuclear-test explosions", L.31, entitled "Amendment of the Treaty banning nuclear weapons tests", and L.41, entitled "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty".

The United States continues to believe that negotiations on and achievement of deep, stabilizing and effectively verifiable reductions in existing nuclear arsenals are the best way to address the threat posed by nuclear weapons and to further the aims of nuclear weapons arms control. A comprehensive nuclear-test ban would not result in any reductions in nuclear weapons, nor deal with the threat posed by such weapons.

United States policy regarding limits on nuclear testing is based on a step-by-step approach. Following the signing by Presidents Bush and Gorbachev of two important verification Protocols to the Threshold Test-Ban Treaty and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty, on 1 June 1990, the appropriate legislative bodies of both sides gave their consent to the ratification of those Treaties. We appreciate the recognition of the successful conclusion of the two Protocols expressed in draft resolution L.41. These Protocols involve new and complex

(Mr. Lehman, United States)

techniques necessary to provide effective verification of the two Treaties, including direct on-site measurement of explosion yields. The unprecedented nature and complexity of these verification provisions require that we gain some experience with them as a guide to the most appropriate steps on further limitations on nuclear testing. This approach is based on the simple proposition that we should learn how well the just-agreed verification régime works as a necessary foundation for making or accepting proposals which build on it.

As we put into practice the new verification Protocols, the United States will be ready to propose negotiations on possible further nuclear testing limitations that make sense from a national security standpoint, contribute to stability and still permit the certainty of a reliable, safe and effective deterrent.

We are convinced, however, that so long as the United States must rely on nuclear weapons for deterrence, we must have a sensible testing programme that ensures the credibility and safety of our forces. In this context, the United States has not identified any further limitations on nuclear testing beyond those now contained in the Threshold Test-Ban Treaty that would be in the national security interest of my country.

A comprehensive nuclear-test ban remains a long-term objective of the United States. We believe that such a ban must be viewed in the context of a time when we do not need to depend on nuclear deterrence to ensure international security and stability, and when we have broad, deep and effectively verifiable arms reductions, substantially improved verification capabilities, expanded confidence-building measures and greater balance in conventional forces.

Draft resolution L.30, entitled "Cessation of all nuclear test explosions", contains numerous provisions with which the United States cannot agree, including the assertion that the prohibition of all nuclear tests is a matter of the highest priority and a call for negotiations on the complete cessation of such tests.

(Mr. Lehman, United States)

Draft resolution L.31, dealing with the forthcoming Amendment Conference of the parties to the limited test-ban Treaty, also contains a number of provisions with which we cannot agree. It improperly seeks, we believe, to intrude into matters that are within the competence solely of that Conference. The United States regards the limited test-ban Treaty as a highly valuable arms-control instrument whose integrity must not be placed at risk. For these and other reasons my delegation voted against draft resolution L.31.

As a party to the limited test-ban Treaty, the United States does not support the Amendment Conference and will oppose the proposed amendment to convert the Treaty into a comprehensive test ban. However, as a depositary of the Treaty, the United States has abided faithfully by its obligations and, together with the other two depositaries, has arrranged for the Conference to be held in New York from 7 to 18 January 1991.

As to draft resolution L.41, entitled "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", most of its provisions reflect the basic premise embodied in its title. As I indicated earlier, the United States does not accept that premise and views a comprehensive test ban as a long-term objective. The United States regrets that it was therefore compelled again to vote against this draft resolution.

While opposing negotiations on a comprehensive test ban, the United States has been willing to join consensus to establish an ad hoc committee in the Conference on Disarmament with a non-negotiating mandate that would permit substantive examination of specific issues relating to a nuclear-test ban, including structure, scope, verification and compliance. An ad hoc committee on this basis was established last July. The United States is pleased that this ad hoc committee was established, and fully participated in its work. We believe the mandate agreed last July is sufficient to allow for useful discussions. Barring unforeseen

(Mr. Lehman, United States)

events, the United States would likely once again join in a consensus to re-establish the ad hoc committee in 1991.

Mr. HOULLEZ (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolutions L.30, L.31 and L.41, in cluster 11.

For my country, the question of halting nuclear tests is of major importance because this is an issue fundamental to international security and stability. The objective is the total, definitive and verifiable halting of tests. However, Belgium continues to support a realistic approach to this question in the broader context of disarmament. We therefore feel that the halting of experimental nuclear tests can only be brought about at the end of a gradual process.

My country would like to see, in the agreements already concluded, the premises for this process, and we hope, too, that in the near future we will have new evidence of mutual good faith among those possessing nuclear weapons. It will be utopian to clamour for an immediate halt to all tests. The States concerned have already expressed their will to go in the right direction by reducing the number of their tests, limiting the conditions in which they can take place and reducing their power.

For these reasons, my delegation, while it regrets the lack of a balanced realistic combination, a generally acceptable fusion of draft resolutions L.30 and L.41, prefers the latter, which focuses on the work of the Ad Hoc Committee - which was able to resume its activities at the last session thanks to the untiring efforts of Ambassador Yamada and Ambassador Donowaki - and on the work of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts.

(Mr. Houllez, Belgium)

We also feel that it is not timely or appropriate now to try to influence through a resolution an Amendment Conference governed by provisions contained in a sovereign text.

In this regard I should like to confirm that my country will participate actively and in good faith in the Conference, although we doubt the real ability of the Conference to resolve the problem of concern to us all.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31 lists several approaches which are not in accordance with our position. We advocate realistic, specific efforts. It also seeks to prolong the Conference beyond the period 7 to 18 January 1991 mentioned in operative paragraph 1. Under operative paragraphs 4 and 5 it would almost be transformed into a permanent body.

Mr. CHADHA (India): I should like to speak on two resolutions on the subject of the nuclear-test ban, namely A/C.1/45/L.30 and A/C.1/45/L.41.

The question of a ban on the testing of nuclear weapons has been a priority issue on the multilateral disarmament agenda for almost 36 years. The objective was clearly reiterated in the preamble of the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, as follows:

"Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time". (United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 480, No. 6964)

My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/45/L.30. However, we note that the scope of the Treaty as illustrated in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.30 is at variance with the generally accepted scope of such a Treaty. In our view, the scope of our work is clearly established by the declaration in the preamble of the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty to which I have just referred. Therefore, our vote in favour of this draft resolution is without prejudice to our position on the scope of a comprehensive test-ban treaty to be

(Mr. Chadha, India)

negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament as envisioned in the preamble of the partial test-ban Treaty.

My delegation has been unable to support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/45/L.41. We regard the recommendations of the General Assembly as critical inputs in the process of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament. In our view, the General Assembly can certainly recommend the issue with greater urgency for action than the one prescribed in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41. The objective of negotiating a comprehensive test-ban treaty should be spelt out in clear terms in the recommendations of the General Assembly. We are aware of the bilateral talks on the subject of nuclear testing between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. However, as stated by the leaders of the Six Nations Initiative in the Stockholm Declaration of January 1988:

"Any agreement that leaves room for continued testing would not be acceptable." (A/43/125, annex)

My delegation would also like to urge that, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, all nuclear-weapon States suspend testing so as to facilitate the negotiation of such a treaty.

Mr. DA COSTA e SILVA (Brazil): Regrettably, my delegation was unable to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41. We had hoped that this year the First Committee would have adopted one draft resolution only on the question of the cessation of all nuclear tests in all environments for all time. While this one draft resolution would probably not have been adopted by consensus, in view of the position of certain States, it would have sent a clear and unequivocal political message of the overwhelming support of the international community for a nuclear-test ban. We would also have given an additional impetus to the efforts towards this end in the Conference on Disarmament and in other forums. Bearing in mind the establishment in the Conference on Disarmament this year of the Ad Hoc

(Mr. Da Costa e Silva, Brazil)

Committee to consider this issue, my delegation found it difficult to understand why an agreement could not be maintained in which an appropriate mandate would be attributed once again to the Ad Hoc Committee in order to pursue the objective of negotiations for which the Conference on Disarmament was created.

As our positive votes for draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.30 and A/C.1/45/L.31 clearly indicate, Brazil will continue actively to pursue in the Conference on Disarmament and other forums the objective of the cessation of all nuclear tests by all States in all environments for all time.

Ms. COURTNEY (Australia): It is with regret that Australia has abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31, on the partial test-ban treaty Amendment Conference. As delegations are aware, Australia attaches the greatest importance to the urgent achievement of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We have just voted on a draft resolution sponsored by Australia, among others, on this question, and we are pleased with the broad support which that resolution commanded. However, we were obliged to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31 for a number of reason. First, Australia continues to believe that the Conference on Disarmament, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, is the appropriate forum in which to negotiate a comprehensive test ban. Secondly, operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of the resolution tend to prejudge the outcome of decisions which correctly will be made by the States Parties to the Treaty at the Conference in January. It is not for the First Committee to take on such a responsibility.

Nevertheless, Australia has been and will continue to be a constructive player in the process that has been initiated by a large number of States. We will make an effort to ensure that as much as possible is achieved in relation to a comprehensive test ban at that Conference, particularly on the important issue of verification.

Mr. ADANK (New Zealand): I should like to explain New Zealand's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31, entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water".

As delegations in this Committee will be well aware, New Zealand is strongly committed to the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty which would ban nuclear testing in all environments for all time. Accordingly, we welcome the forthcoming partial-test-ban Treaty Amendment Conference since we think it should provide an opportunity for a broad ranging discussion of test-ban issues, a discussion in which all partial-test-ban Treaty States parties will be able to participate on an equal footing.

We are pleased to note that at the organizational meeting for the Conference earlier this year a constructive atmosphere prevailed ensuring that the procedural difficulties associated with the convening of the Conference were overcome. It is our hope that a similar constructive atmosphere will prevail at the January Conference.

New Zealand would therefore have liked to have supported the draft resolution on the January Conference but the wording included in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31 has presented us with certain difficulties.

(Mr. Adank, New Zealand)

In particular we have reservations about operative paragraphs 4 and 5 since they tend to prejudge procedural decisions that only the parties to the partial test-ban Treaty can take at the forthcoming Conference. We wish to reiterate, however, that New Zealand will be participating actively and constructively at the January Conference in the hope that it can contribute to the future attainment of a comprehensive test ban. We would encourage all other States parties to the partial-test-ban Treaty to do likewise.

Mr. MANZHOSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wishes to explain its vote on the draft resolutions just adopted: A/C.1/45/L.30, A/C.1/45/L.31 and A/C.1/45/L.41 on the question of a nuclear-test ban. The Soviet Union is a convinced supporter of a nuclear-test ban, and the creation of the necessary conditions for the immediate resolution of this question will, as we see it, facilitate the combination of bilateral and multilateral efforts. The parallelism of action here is not only justified but necessary. Therefore we are prepared to work towards achieving this end through bilateral negotiations with the United States, in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, and in the forthcoming Amendment Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water to be held in January. We believe that a weighty contribution to this will be made by the parliaments and public opinion of various countries.

In this connection I wish to recall the recent proposal made by the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union regarding the holding of a world parliamentary referendum on this question.

We supported the draft resolution presented by Australia and Mexico regarding the urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty and the cessation of

(Mr. Manzhosov, USSR)

all nuclear-test explosions. We wish to express our deep regret that attempts to combine these rather similar drafts because of their end purpose were not crowned with success this year. It is our hope that at the forthcoming session on this question a single draft resolution can be adopted.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31, entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water", the Soviet Union is a Depositary Government of that Treaty and from the very outset has supported the idea of holding an amendment conference in order to make this Treaty applicable also to underground explosions. We believe that this Conference will take place in a non-confrontational way and will take concrete steps leading to a general and complete ban on nuclear-weapon tests. It is along these lines that the Soviet delegation will work at the forthcoming Conference to be held in January.

The Soviet delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31. At the same time, as we see it, some of the operative paragraphs in the draft resolution to a certain extent prejudge the decisions to be taken by the forthcoming Conference. It is our belief that the recommendations regarding further steps will be elaborated and adopted at the Conference itself.

Mr. JANDL (Austria): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31, entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water", the Austrian delegation wishes to stress the following facts. Austria has always very strongly advocated a comprehensive test ban because only such a measure would constitute a guarantee against the production, manufacture or further refinement of nuclear weapons. An effective test ban would be a most valuable instrument in the achievement of genuine nuclear disarmament. I recall that my Government made a public appeal to the Soviet Union

(Mr. Jandl, Austria)

and the United States in which it requested an immediate stop to nuclear testing and called for an early start in negotiations with a view to a comprehensive test ban. Various attempts have been made to achieve a comprehensive test ban. The re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee within the Conference on Disarmament in July this year was an encouraging sign. We hope that agreement on a negotiating mandate for this body will be reached very soon because we are of the opinion that the Conference on Disarmament is the most appropriate forum in which to negotiate a comprehensive test ban. As such a comprehensive test ban is an urgent necessity we hope that the States concerned will participate in these endeavours in a flexible and constructive manner.

In the light of this conviction my delegation is glad to be one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41, entitled "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty". In this context we would like to commend those delegations that have tried to merge draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.30 and A/C.1/45/L.41 since a single text on this subject would have been an extremely important achievement. Unfortunately, and much to my delegation's regret, the efforts failed. Nevertheless we sincerely hope that the relevant texts can be merged next year.

The Amendment Conference on the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty, the intention of which is also the possible achievement of a comprehensive test ban, will take place in January next year. Because of its long-standing commitment to a universal test ban, Austria will participate in an open, co-operative and active way. The discussions expected will certainly make the various opinions clearer. Mutual understanding will in this way be increased. Although the Conference can thus function as a confidence- and security-building measure in itself and as a clearing-house for various ideas on a comprehensive test ban it is unlikely that

(Mr. Jandl, Austria)

such a test ban could be achieved through it. Because of the formulation of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31 we were unfortunately not in a position to support it. Had there been a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 we would gladly have voted in favour of this provision, which calls upon the nuclear-weapon States to observe an agreed moratorium or unilateral moratoria.

Mr. ELM (Sweden): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31, just adopted by the Committee. Sweden will participate in the Amendment Conference with the aim of making a constructive contribution to its work. A successful outcome of the Conference will necessitate a contribution by all States parties to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water. The preparatory process had been characterized by a spirit of compromise in finding practical solutions to outstanding pertinent issues. It is to be hoped that this approach will also mark the proceedings during the Amendment Conference itself. The draft resolution contains recommendations that address details of the organization of the substantive work of the Amendment Conference. It is the position of Sweden that these issues should be dealt with at the Conference and agreed by the parties to the Treaty. For these reasons my delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31.

Mr. AMIGUES (France) (interpretation from French): Once again France was led to cast a negative vote on the draft resolutions dealing with nuclear-test bans, in this particular case draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.30 and A/C.1/45/L.41, for reasons which we have frequently recalled in the past. My country considers that banning nuclear tests can only be part of the effective nuclear disarmament process in accordance with paragraph 51 of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, of 1978.

(Mr. Amigues, France)

Such a ban should be made possible by sufficient progress in nuclear disarmament, so that the foundations of international security are not in any way jeopardized. It cannot therefore be considered a precondition for, or even have priority over, a substantial reduction in the nuclear arsenals of the two nuclear Powers with the most weapons.

France made the choice of having an independent defence based on a deterrent force which is kept to a minimum. To ensure the credibility of that force, France must continue tests, which are necessary for technological reasons. We have reduced the annual number of these tests from eight to six. In this connection France has a policy of transparency that has led it, first, to notify other States of each test and to inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations about them each year; and, secondly, to open its test centre to international missions of independent scientists, who have attested that the French tests are harmless to the population and the environment.

The French delegation also wishes to state for the record that France did not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.30 and abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41, as the former satisfactorily reflects the high urgency and priority Argentina attaches to the matter of concluding a treaty prohibiting nuclear-test explosions by all States for all time. In our opinion there is no argument to justify putting off negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament.

Nevertheless, we supported, in a broad-minded and constructive spirit, those efforts aimed at merging the opinions of the differing schools of thought on this issue in a common text, and we express our gratitude to the sponsors of both draft

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

resolutions, particularly the delegations of Australia and Mexico, whose efforts in support of a unified, compromise text we were prepared to support though our aspirations are more along the lines of draft resolution L.30, for which we voted. We regret that some delegations did not demonstrate the same willingness to compromise on a matter which, because of its urgency, can wait no longer. We continue to hope that those delegations will give further thought to this so that we can make progress on the substantive aspects of these various issues.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on a draft resolution in cluster 10, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.12/Rev.1, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: report of the Disarmament Commission". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Indonesia at the Committee's 38th meeting, on 16 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.12/Rev.1 are: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Cameroon, China, Denmark, Ecuador, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Nigeria, Sweden, Togo, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.12/Rev.1 be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to do so?

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.12/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions after the decision the Committee has just taken.

Mr. AMIGUES (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation is pleased to have been able to associate itself with the consensus on draft resolution L.12/Rev.1. Nevertheless, in connection with paragraph 4 of this draft, we think it important to recall that the report of the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission on item 7 of the agenda, regarding naval armaments and disarmament, was not formally adopted by the Commission, and that the conclusions and recommendations of the consultation group are to be found in a working document prepared by the Chairman, which was simply annexed to the Commission's report.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the following draft resolutions, which are listed in cluster 13: A/C.1/45/L.10, A/C.1/45/L.49 and A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make a statement other than in explanation of their positions on draft resolutions in cluster 13.

Mr. JAYASINGHE (Sri Lanka): When my delegation, on behalf of the non-aligned States members of this Committee, introduced the draft resolution on agenda item 61, "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", it had the opportunity to state that there exists a genuine desire on the part of the international community to work towards an international system which will increasingly rely less on military capabilities and related activities. There is also an understanding which is gaining wide acceptance that these issues should be addressed at the global and regional levels. In this regard, militarily powerful countries, in particular the super-Powers, have taken some encouraging steps, although these measures remain far short of the desired goals. We also believe that in our endeavours to achieve lasting international peace and security collective measures should play an important role. In this context global and regional efforts should complement each other. This being our common objective, the proposal to establish a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean cannot escape our serious attention.

The recent developments in the Indian Ocean region and in the adjacent areas also call for a closer examination of this proposal with a view to ascertaining how the establishment of a zone of peace could be of benefit in bringing stability to the area. The proposal to establish a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region should necessarily be a time-consuming and a long, drawn-out process in which the encouragement and the endorsement of those concerned are vital. It should grow around international consensus. Until such a conducive environment is created the

(Mr. Jayasinghe, Sri Lanka)

international community has to continue to work on this important proposal both within the framework of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and outside it.

Some States Members are of the view that the Ad Hoc Committee has failed to achieve the expected results and therefore it should be dismantled or its activities should be curtailed. The inability of the Committee to complete its work is by no means a bad reflection on the work of the Committee, but it is a clear demonstration of the complexity of the issues involved. These issues to a large extent embrace many concerns of States Members that are in the region as well as those outside it.

Attempts have been made over past years to harmonize differing views of the States Members, and considerable progress has been made in this respect. In the procedural aspect of the preparatory work for the Conference the Ad Hoc Committee has been able to finalize the agenda of the Colombo Conference. The Ad Hoc Committee also made considerable progress in the reading of the draft rules of procedure during the spring session this year. In the substantive aspect of the preparatory work the Ad Hoc Committee has before it a document containing elements, in a somewhat elaborated form, which may be taken into account in the preparation of the Final Document of the Colombo Conference. However, it was the view of the Ad Hoc Committee that completion of the remaining preparatory work would be necessary before we hold the long-awaited Conference.

In view of this understanding, the Chairman of the Committee was requested to consult the host Government and ascertain whether it is prepared to host the Conference in 199; instead of 1991. As the Committee is aware, the Government of Sri Lanka acceded to this request. Accordingly, the holding of the Colombo Conference has now been scheduled for 1992, as may be observed from paragraph 7 of the draft resolution before the Committee.

(Mr. Jayasinghe, Sri Lanka)

It is the earnest hope of my delegation that the States Members who left the Ad Hoc Committee will be in a position to rejoin it. My delegation would also like to invite those delegations that decided not to participate in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee this year to reconsider their decision. This appeal is made particularly in view of the co-operative atmosphere prevailing in the conduct of international relations. We recognize that there exist serious differences in the interpretation of the Declaration of 1971 and its applicability. However, such differences could be narrowed only through dialogue with the objective of seeking common grounds in the implementation of the Declaration.

The relevance of the proposal to establish a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region and the support it receives from the international community was clearly demonstrated last year by 137 States Members voting in favour of resolution 44/120. Since the adoption of that resolution the developments that have taken place on the international scene have made the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region more relevant. It is therefore the responsibility of all States Members to adopt a constructive approach to the implementation process of the Declaration and vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/45/L.10.

Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.10, Bangladesh reaffirms its full support for the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. We are committed to co-operating with all concerned to that end. We commend Sri Lanka for the significant contribution it has been making in this respect.

Long years of seemingly futile efforts on the matter at hand may have bred a modicum of impatience, but impatience is often a bad advisor, and fatigue is always a poor guide. We have no option but to continue our efforts towards our goal. The total membership of the Ad Hoc Committee, all working together, must resolutely

(Mr. Chowdhury, Bangladesh)

address itself to this purpose. Striving for peace must be a joint undertaking. The global reaction to the recent sad events in the Gulf has amply attested to this simple but incontrovertible fact. Success in attaining our goals will mean much for our people, as it will for others similiarly placed among the littorals.

We are engaged in a relentless struggle to achieve for our peoples an acceptable quality of life. Our aim is sustainable development. There is little we can hope to achieve unless we are able to work in an environment of peace and stability. Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.10 may not achieve it for us completely, but we believe it will surely help.

We have heard it said that the Indian Ocean has never been an idyllic lake of peace. There may indeed be truth in this assertion. However, patterns of history can and do change with human effort, and human effort must now focus sharply on positively altering the current ambience of what have been called the multifaceted, problem-ridden and colourful realities of a region where one third of humanity lives.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.10, to our mind, forms part of that effort. We feel confident that this Committee will accord it overwhelming support.

Mrs. MULAMULA (United Republic of Tanzania): My delegation wishes to associate itself with the statement made by the representative of Sri Lanka on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.10 on behalf of the non-aligned countries sponsoring this draft resolution.

In addition, my delegation wishes to reiterate its conviction that the situation in the Gulf has made it even more imperative for a co-operative and joint endeavour towards the realization of the objectives contained in the Declaration on the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. It is with this view in mind that we expect a constructive attitude and co-operation in adopting draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.10.

Mr. GAJDA (Hungary): The tenth anniversary of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) is a fitting occasion for all Member States to congratulate UNIDIR on its first decade of outstanding activity and praiseworthy results.

In the course of these years the Institute has not only established its reputation - which is already comparable to that of many, more senior institutions - but it has also become a workshop whose products are much in demand and well appreciated.

From the reports of the Director of the Institute, we have a fairly accurate and objective picture of the completed projects and the numerous publications, as well as of the ongoing activities and the work programmes for the forthcoming periods. Instead of recalling facts that are already well known, allow me to mention, very briefly, only a few fresh examples from our own experience of co-operation with UNIDIR.

At the end of last September, following the period covered by the last report, an expert meeting was held in Budapest to examine issues related to non-military aspects of security. Plans have already been prepared to organize next spring - again in our capital - another meeting of UNIDIR, this time on European regional security questions. The main purpose of the Conference is to undertake a thorough analysis and evaluation of the results and experiences gained so far in East Central Europe, and then to draw general, conceptual lessons of a global character, which may be applicable, under different conditions, in other regions. It is also envisaged, as a probable new field of research, that a group of experts might define and analyse the new challenges which the countries of our subregion must face in the fields of military and security policy as a consequence of a situation in which the Warsaw Treaty is becoming de facto incapable of functioning. Finally,

(Mr. Gajda, Hungary)

the recapitulation of this research programme is envisaged for a UNIDIR conference to be held in 1992 in Budapest.

I believe these examples can give a glimpse of the many-faceted activities of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, and testify to its ability to respond quickly to the rapid changes and new challenges that we all have to face.

In conclusion, the Hungarian delegation would like to express its best wishes and continued support to UNIDIR in its important and useful work.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon those delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of their vote before the voting on draft resolutions in cluster 13.

Mr. AGAYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wishes to express its support for draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.10, "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

In our view, the present situation in the region obliges the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, in their turn, to state, once again, as is done in this body, that the preparatory work for the Conference in Colombo has been completed. It is high time the Committee got down to work on the substance of the problem, the preparation of a final document or agreement which would crystallize, in legal terms, the objectives of the 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, taking into account the obligations of both the littoral States and the main users of the Indian Ocean, including the five permanent members of the Security Council.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. Schevardnadze, referred to this recently in Vladivostok. We hope the Ad Hoc Committee will take specific steps in this direction in the coming year.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions in cluster 13, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.10, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations which are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the 26th meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1990. The draft resolution has programme budget implications, which are given in document A/C.1/45/L.55

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.10 was submitted by Yugoslavia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations which are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.10. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.10 was adopted by 107 votes to 4, with 17 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49, entitled "General and complete disarmament: Charting potential uses of resources allocated to military activities for civilian endeavours to protect the environment". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1990. The draft resolution has programme budget implications, which are given in document A/C.1/45/L.60.

I call on the Committee Secretary to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49 are: Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Costa Rica, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mexico, Suriname, Sweden, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49 was adopted by 113 votes to 3, with 12 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session; tenth anniversary of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research".

(The Chairman)

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of France at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1990. It has programme budget implications, which are contained in document A/C.1/45/L.62.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1 are the following: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, China, Egypt, Ecuador, France, Greece, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Hungary, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1 be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. GEVERS (Netherlands): The Netherlands has taken careful note of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49, entitled, "Charting potential uses of resources allocated to military activities for civilian endeavours to protect the environment", which was introduced by the representative of Sweden. Indeed, we fully subscribe to the idea that protection of the environment should be a priority for all States.

The commitment of the Netherlands to protection of the environment is clear, not only from its own national efforts but also from its political endeavours to focus international attention on the subject. I refer to The Hague Summit

(Mr. Gevers, Netherlands)

Meeting on the Protection of the Global Atmosphere, of March 1989, and the Ministerial Conference on Atmospheric Pollution and Climatic Change, held at Noordwijk in November of the same year.

The Netherlands has initiated practical steps leading to international co-operation on this important matter, and in fact continues to organize international expert meetings as part of the preparatory process for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development to be held in Brazil in 1992. I might mention in particular a meeting of experts on environment and human settlements, organized together with the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements, which was held in The Hague last week. I might mention also an international meeting on agriculture and environmental strategies organized together with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which will be held in 's Hertogenbosch in April 1991.

Despite the high priority which we attach to the protection of the environment, we cannot lend unqualified support to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49. In the first place, a variety of other subjects springs easily to mind as possible beneficiaries of the resources that could potentially become available in the future as a result of disarmament measures. Moreover, we have been engaged in other efforts, for example the proposal for the submission to the Secretary-General of the views of Member States on various aspects of the process of conversion of military resources to civilian purposes.

More broadly, I might add that for the time being the actual implementation of disarmament agreements is expensive; it takes money.

Another thing that is lacking in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49 is that it does not address the important aspect of security.

In questioning the need for the undertaking of this particular study, I would refer to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1, in which we request the United

(Mr. Gevers, Netherlands)

Nations Institute for Disarmament Research to prepare a research report on the economic aspects of disarmament, which has just been adopted by consensus.

In the past we have expressed some reservations on the appropriateness of dealing with conversion issues in the framework of the First Committee. We believe that the same applies to the study proposed by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49, which also links its study with the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. Now that real disarmament is gaining momentum, the question of what can be done with available resources should of course be looked at carefully, but in the appropriate forum.

At the same time, however, we should not lose sight of our own primary responsibility in the First Committee, which is to promote arms control and disarmament itself.

Mr. BRECKON (United States of America): The United States has asked to speak in order to explain its vote against draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49, entitled "Charting potential uses of resources allocated to military activities for civilian endeavours to protect the environment", and its note on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1, entitled "Tenth Anniversary of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research".

With regard to the first draft resolution, the United States strongly endorses cost effective and meaningful efforts to improve the environment. In fact, we joined in the adoption of resolution 44/228, by which the General Assembly convenes a United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Brazil in 1992. However, that resolution was submitted in the Second Committee which is tasked with dealing with such matters. We do not believe that the First Committee is the appropriate forum to call for a study of the potential uses of military resources for civilian endeavours to protect the environment. Additionally, we have a number of questions about the potential for using military know-how, technology, infrastructure and production for environmental purposes, for we believe such activity is a matter for the disposition of individual States or parties to military reduction agreements. Accordingly, the United States had to vote against the draft resolution.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1, while the United States joined in the consensus, we would like to restate our long-standing opposition to the use of regular United Nations budget funds to support the operations of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR). The Institute was founded on the understanding that it would operate on the basis of voluntary contributions. We would still prefer that it do so.

Mr. AMIGUES (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation wishes to give its reasons for opposing draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49, entitled "Charting potential uses of resources allocated to military activities for civilian endeavours to protect the environment".

Disarmament and the protection of the environmental are two of the main challenges of our time. My country attaches great importance to these two questions, which are difficult and complex, but different in nature. So it seems to us to be dangerous to establish too close a link between them, as does draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49.

In the third preambular paragraph three distinct concepts are amalgamated: disarmament, development and protection of the environment. Is it necessary to recall that the link is not between disarmament and development only but between disarmament, development and security, as was recognized in the Final Document of the 1987 Conference. Similarly, in both the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4, there is reference to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development to be held in 1992 and the implication that disarmament questions will be raised during that meeting.

We believe that the 1992 Conference should not be diverted from its essential objective, which is to deal at a high level with protection of the environment.

Finally, draft resolution A/C.145/L.49 raises, in summary form the highly complex questions of the conversion of military resources and the consequences for international security of progress in research and technology.

We want to be clearly understood. We do not oppose the use of resources, such as the human and technical competence of the armed forces of different countries, for development and humanitarian purposes. We even made a proposal to this effect at the 1987 Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

(Mr. Amigues, France)

However, and this is reflected in paragraph 35(c)(v)(c) of its Final Document, we cannot accept a draft resolution which appears to give credence to the thesis that disarmament is a prerequisite for protection of the environment, which would mean running the risk of diverting the 1992 Conference from its objective.

Mr. GREEN (United Kingdom): I should like to explain why the United Kingdom voted against draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49, entitled "Charting the potential uses of resources allocated to military activities for civilian endeavours to protect the environment".

At the outset I would like to make it clear that the protection of the environment is a matter of very high priority as far as the United Kingdom is concerned. This is why we are giving full support to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, which is due to be held in 1992 and is referred to in the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49.

The secretariat for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development has been mandated to produce a number of studies for the next meeting of the Preparatory Committee of the Conference. These studies relate to questions such as the availability of resources for environmental protection, technology transfer, and the relationship between economic and environmental policy. I fear that the study proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49 would duplicate this work and might even dissipate effort in this important area of United Nations activities.

The United Kingdom also has reservations about making too direct a link between disarmament and the environment. Security will always be the primary influence on our disarmament policies and we cannot make commitments of our military resources without always first assessing our security needs, which may vary. We are also aware that resources freed by reduction of our military budgets could be allocated to equally needy causes in the field of development.

(Mr. Green, United Kingdom)

I should like to explain our vote also on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1, relating to the United Nations Institute for Disarmament and Research (UNIDIR). My delegation was grateful to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53 for introducing a revised text which allowed us to join in the consensus. This incorporated changes which reduced the financial implications for the United Nations budget of the research report which UNIDIR is being asked to undertake. Our support for this draft resolution, however, is without prejudice to our long-standing position that such work should be funded entirely from voluntary contributions.

Mr. WATANABE (Japan): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.10, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

The Government of Japan supports in principle the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean. It firmly believes that there should be a prior harmonization of views among the countries concerned, particularly on the basic substantive issues.

(Mr. Watanabe, Japan)

Japan deeply regrets that the Committee has made no serious attempt to attain this goal. Nor does the draft resolution which has just been adopted demonstrate any attempt to bridge the differences of views. On the contrary, this is a draft resolution that once again aims at convening a conference without any prospect of attaining a harmonization of views. Japan therefore had no choice but to vote again draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.10.

Mr. DUBUISSON (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49 entitled "Charting potential uses of resources allocated to military activities for civilian endeavours to protect the environment".

Like those that sponsored the draft resolution which has just been voted upon, my country feels both satisfaction at the progress achieved in the field of disarmament and also concern about the growing deterioration of the environment. Both those aspects are essentially subjects of universal interest, and it is up to every State to ensure favourable developments in regard to them.

Nevertheless, if there were a link between the desired reduction of defence spending and the allocation of resources thus made available to other activities, whatever they might be, it would meet a whole set of considerations which are very complex and which would take too long to set forth in detail. In any case, it would depend on the sovereignty of each State freely to choose how it would allocate the resources made available by disarmament, which itself would be defined by national security criteria.

My delegation also notes that there is some confusion here between use of military expenditure for civilian purposes and the concept of conversion. Conversion is a matter which does not affect many countries, such as ours, whose level of military expenditure does not go beyond their security requirements.

(Mr. Dubuisson, Belgium)

Because of the rather vague and somewhat hasty presentation of this draft resolution, and also because of the tendency to deal with the environment in a number of different international forums, my delegation had to abstain on this text. But we emphasize the real efforts being made by Belgium to ensure a better standard of living for its population and for its neighbours.

Ms. COURTNEY (Australia): Australia voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.10, on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, because we continue to be strongly supportive of the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. As States are aware, Australia continues to play a constructive and active role in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, to which this draft resolution refers. Nevertheless, we felt obliged to explain our affirmative vote on the draft resolution in the light of developments in the Ad Hoc Committee over the past year.

This draft resolution, with requisite updating, is almost identical to that of General Assembly resolution 44/120. However, the situation in which we find ourselves in the Ad Hoc Committee is far from identical to the one last year. A number of countries have declined to participate during the 1990 sessions, while three States have chosen to withdraw completely from the Committee itself. Australia does not condone such action. On the contrary, we decline to behave in a similar manner. The fact is, however, that the Ad Hoc Committee was as a result faced with an entirely new situation this year, and its work would appear to have failed to reflect this reality.

Australia is acutely aware of the vigorous attempts which all States participating in the Ad Hoc Committee made to seek to find new approaches and new avenues to reinvigorate and bolster up the Ad Hoc Committee process. Unfortunately, all these attempts failed. This was clearly as a result of

(Ms. Courtney, Australia)

differing perceptions between the remaining Ad Hoc Committee members as to the direction which the future work might take. It became obvious that unless the Committee members could agree on such new directions the Committee's work would be effectively stalemated and would run the risk of exhausting its usefulness.

Australia therefore hopes that if the Committee cannot find a new approach to the now 20-year-long preparatory committee process in which we have been engaged, it will find the means to finalize the remaining procedural issues during 1991 and in accordance with the draft resolution for which we have just voted, will go ahead and convene its conference in 1992 or at the earliest possible date.

Mr. HUSSAIN (Pakistan): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49, entitled "Charting potential uses of resources allocated to military activities for civilian endeavours to protect the environment".

The relationship between disarmament and development has been the subject of intense study over the past few years. In fact, a major conference on the subject took place a few years ago. Discussions on this issue have clearly underlined the need to divert resources, funds and technologies released through disarmament to social and economic development, including environmental protection, particularly in the developing countries.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.49 unfortunately focuses on the environmental aspects and does not pay adequate attention to economic and social development. Regrettably, our efforts to have the sponsors amend the draft resolution in order to include these vital aspects did not bear fruit. We were therefore constrained to abstain on this draft resolution.

Mr. ESENLI (Turkey): My delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.10, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", which the First Committee has just adopted. We regret that this year, as in the case of similar draft resolutions in the past, we were unable to vote in favour, although we agree with the draft resolution's broader objective and traditionally joined the consensus which had established itself around such texts prior to 1989.

We abstained because the original members of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, which are the parties directly concerned, are still not in agreement. This is reflected in the fact that the draft resolution before us could not be adopted by consensus. We hope that the existing differences will be overcome in the future so that we may return to the practice of adopting such draft resolutions by consensus.

Mr. ELM (Sweden): Sweden joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1, entitled "Tenth anniversary of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research", which was introduced by the representative of France.

Sweden supports the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) and over the years has been a voluntary contributor to the research activities of the Institute. We are however doubtful about the allocation of regular budget resources for research activities undertaken outside the framework of the Department of Disarmament Affairs.

Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland): My delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1, entitled "Tenth anniversary of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research". We did so because we support the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) as a research institution conducting independent research on problems relating to disarmament. We recognize the importance and high quality of the work of UNIDIR in execution of its mandate. We have made financial contributions to the Institute and support its activities in other ways. Our contribution for 1991 will be more than $US 20,000.

We also consider that economic aspects of disarmament require independent and in-depth research and that UNIDIR is well suited to that kind of research. We are, however, troubled by the implications of this draft resolution for the role of UNIDIR. In the draft resolution, the General Assembly reiterates the necessity for independent research by UNIDIR, while at the same time requesting it to prepare a research report. My delegation is somewhat at pains to reconcile these two desiderata.

While recognizing that the Statute of the Institute allows such requests and that there are precedents in this regard from the early 1980s, it would seem to us that an independent research institution should decide on its research project independently without the direct involvement of a political body such as the General Assembly. Any advice required in this regard can be given by the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters which, as the draft resolution notes, also acts as the Board of Trustees for UNIDIR. Moreover, asking UNIDIR to prepare a study, even if it is called a research report, for the consideration of the General Assembly tends to blur the important distinction between United Nations studies, which are essentially political in character, and truly academic studies that UNIDIR, in our view, was established to undertake.

Mr. DJIENA WEMBOU (Cameroon) (interpretation from French): At the end of this process of adopting draft resolutions in the Committee, my delegation wishes to make a few brief comments on some problems we find to be of paramount importance.

First of all, however, we wish to thank you, Sir, for the remarkable skill with which you have been directing our work and particularly your great patience and refusal to apply rule 128 of the rules of procedure during explanations of vote, before or after the vote. Intense explanations, while no doubt very useful and necessary, are sometimes rather lengthy and detailed.

Having made that point, my country, which was the initiator of General Assembly resolution 42/42 N, on the rationalization of the work of the First Committee, adopted at the forty-second session of the General Assembly, would like to commend the efforts made along these lines that resulted in a considerable reduction in the number of draft resolutions on disarmament and the merging of a number of important drafts on allied or similar subjects. We hope these efforts will be continued. Through the rationalization of the work of the First Committee we can improve the Organization's ability to deal effectively with disarmament matters, which can only strengthen the role of the Organization as a whole and enable us to make a unique statement on matters as crucial as the cessation of nuclear tests through the many draft resolutions put forward on the same subject. My delegation wishes to stress that the rationalization of the Committee's work is not a question of papering over legitimate differences of view; it is, rather, a question of differences of evaluation and differences in the political and geographical situations of certain countries.

We also wish to refer to the significance and urgency of two problems we believe to be important in the multilateral disarmament process: the cessation of nuclear tests and non-proliferation.

(Mr. Djiena Wembou, Cameroon)

First, as to the cessation of nuclear tests. First, in dealing with the cessation of nuclear tests, my delegation has had an opportunity to say that it would like to encourage the bilateral efforts being made by the two major Powers at the end of the twentieth century in this regard. We wish now to say that care should be taken to avoid qualitative improvements offsetting any quantitative reductions that might take place. We should increase our efforts in the light of the situation now prevailing in international relations, where there have been considerable improvements; we should redouble our efforts precisely because of the present international climate and seriously consider the question of halting nuclear tests.

Secondly, as regards non-proliferation, we are pleased that, through draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39, the Committee has accepted co-operation between the Organization of African Unity and the General Assembly to enable Africa to draw up a treaty on non-proliferation. Africa was the first region to demonstrate its support for non-proliferation. The efforts of the Organization of African Unity, which have always led to the adoption of draft resolutions by this Committee on this matter, have been sustained, and it is our hope that the meetings of experts will enable Africa to have its own instrument, as does Latin America, so that it can make its modest contribution to the elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world.

Finally we wish to stress the importance of studies the General Assembly requests of the Department for Disarmament Affairs or the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research. We find it somewhat curious that some delegations have criticized such studies, even calling them obsolete, useless or pointless, while the same delegations claim studies should be carried out on questions of particular interest to them.

(Mr. Djiena Wembou, Cameroon)

Finally, I wish to say that the adoption of the draft resolution on the Disarmament Commission's report is very much appreciated by my delegation. With regard to the matters that have been agreed upon by the Commission, we hope that at its next session the Assembly will be able to make the necessary practical arrangements to give concrete effect to the Commission's recommendations.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now concluded its consideration of, and action on, draft resolutions under all disarmament agenda items, namely, items 45 to 66 and 155.

I should like to make some brief observations on the successful conclusion of this phase of our work. We began our deliberation on disarmament items one month ago, on 15 October, with the shared hope that the changing international climate would facilitate the process of arms limitation and disarmament. Representatives also seemed to be interested in rationalizing and streamlining the work of the Committee, to reflect the new changes. Although I cannot claim that we have been able to accomplish all of this in this session, I can confidently affirm that the Committee has taken a number of steps in that direction: the Committee has made significant headway in narrowing important differences, both broadening the areas of consensus and taking practical steps in the areas of disarmament and the further rationalization of the work of the Committee. I was most impressed by the greater sense of purpose and the spirit of co-operation displayed by all delegations during this phase of our work.

This year once again, the Committee was able to adopt more draft resolutions without a vote than it had the year before. Three years ago, 79 proposals were submitted; two years ago, 74; and last year, 64 draft resolutions. This year, a total of only 54 draft resolutions and decisions were submitted by Member States, 25 fewer than only three years ago. Of these 54 draft resolutions and decisions, the Committee was able to adopt 25 without a vote, almost 50 per cent of the total.

On those issues on which agreement could not be reached, the Committee can look forward next year to the prospect that renewed efforts will be made to define and reach commonly held objectives, objectives that would serve to strengthen the cause of disarmament and international peace and security.

(The Chairman)

In recent years, increasing attention has been paid to the question of the rationalization of the work of the First Committee. Various views have been expressed and proposals made by delegations on how to refine and streamline the work and the proceedings of the Committee. The former Chairmen of the First Committee have undertaken consultations and underlined the need for a more rational and focused discussion of, and action on, the issues, including rearrangement of the Committee's agenda. Consequently, the Committee has, over the years, devoted some of its efforts to this matter and adopted certain specific recommendations in this regard, such as those contained in resolution 42/42 N. Several former Chairmen of the First Committee have also presented their papers to the Committee, containing various suggestions on the issue, for example, documents A/C.1/39/9 and A/C.1/43/9.

As part of the continuing process of rationalization of the work of the First Committee, as you all know I also initiated extensive consultations among delegations on the issue, and held several informal, open-ended meetings of the Friends of the Chairman during the current session. Taking into account the various views expressed and the proposals made in the course of those consultations, I am of the opinion that further intensive consultations on the subject will be necessary, as part of a continuing process. Accordingly, it will be my intention, with the assistance and co-operation of the Secretariat, to undertake the necessary consultations during the period that lies ahead, and to make an informal report on the results of those consultations to the Chairman of the First Committee at the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly. I shall endeavour, to the extent possible, to conduct those consultations both in New York and in Geneva.

(The Chairman)

I would also like to take this opportunity to note that the Committee has once again charged the Department for Disarmament Affairs with a number of important tasks and responsibilities. These additional tasks entrusted to the Department are evidence of the confidence that the membership places in the Secretariat and the Department. In this connection, I would like to express my gratitude to the Secretariat for the usual efficient manner in which it has facilitated the work of the First Committee at this forty-fifth session. The Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Yasushi Akashi, the Secretary of the First Committee, Mr. Sohrab Kheradi, and his assistants Mr. Sattar, Mr. Lin, Mr. Ishiguri, Mr. Gerardi-Siebert, Ms. Patil and Ms. Marcaillou, along with the entire staff of the Secretariat and the other Committee officers, are crucial to the smooth way in which our work has progressed.

Before I conclude, I would like to say that it is my hope that the trends we have witnessed to date, and of which I spoke earlier - that is, the narrowing of our differences, the broadening of our areas of concern, and the striving towards practical steps in the field of disarmament - will continue, and be strengthened, not only in the next stage our our work, which begins on Monday, but also in the coming years. I am optimistic that this Committee will indeed continue to approach its work and the important issues before it in a positive and purposeful manner.

I understand that several ambassadors and representatives who have come from Geneva and their various capitals will be returning to their posts after the meeting today. While wishing them bon voyage, I would like to offer them my sincere thanks for their valuable co-operation and contributions. For those of us who are staying on, I would like to express optimism that the next stage of our work will proceed as productively as this one.

(The Chairman)

Before adjourning the meeting, I would like to remind members of the Committee that, in accordance with the Committee's programme of work and timetable, on Monday, 19 November, the Committee will begin its general debate, consideration of and action on agenda item 67, "Question of Antarctica".

I would therefore urge delegations to kindly inscribe their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible in order to enable the Committee to make full use of the conference facilities available to it.

I would also like to remind delegations that the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions on agenda item 67 is Monday, 19 November, at 12 noon.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.